DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 493 SO 034 354

AUTHOR	Hunter, Susan; Brisbin, Richard A., Jr.
TITLE	Civic and Political Education in Political Science: A Survey of Practices.
PUB DATE	2002-08-00
NOTE	36p.; "Partial support for the project came from a grant awarded by Pennsylvania and West Virginia Campus Compacts funded by a Corporation for National and Community Service Learn and Serve Grant." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Boston, MA, August 28-September 1, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Citizenship Responsibility; Experiential Learning; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Political Science; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Administrator Surveys; *Political Education

ABSTRACT

This paper provides information about efforts of political scientists to enlighten students about the value of democratic, civic, and political norms and procedures, and to encourage civic engagement. The paper's research question was: How and to what extent do college/university political science faculty engage in civic and political education that enlightens students and encourages civic engagement? In answering this general question the paper provides data to answer four specific questions: (1) To what extent do political science faculty consider education about citizenship to be a primary teaching objective? (2) Are the faculty members who rank citizenship education as an important pedagogical objective more likely to be participants in civic and political organizations? (3) If faculty members believe citizenship education to be a primary focus for their teaching, are they more likely than other faculty to use an experiential learning pedagogy? and (4) Do departments promote and reward faculty efforts in civic and political education? To address these questions, the paper uses data from a 2002 national survey of political science department faculty and chairs. Findings suggest that faculty respondents tended to believe that teaching civic responsibility was a fairly important goal, and a smaller number (but still a majority) felt it was appropriate to require civic and political activity. Faculty level of civic and political engagement is a better predictor of faculty involvement in civic and political education than faculty rank, type of department, gender, or even perceived appropriateness of teaching such courses. Appended are the faculty questionnaire, the chair questionnaire, and variables used in analysis. (Contains 61 references and 6 tables.) (Author/BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 470 493

Civic and Political Education in Political Science: A Survey of Practices

Susan Hunter and Richard A. Brisbin, Jr.*

Department of Political Science
West Virginia University
Box 6317
Morgantown, WV 26506-6317

Telephone: 304-293-3811 ext. 5292
E-mail contact: libertree@charter.net

SO 034 354

The authors wish to thank Frank Vaughan for assistance. Partial support for the project came from a grant awarded by Pennsylvania and West Virginia Campus Compacts funded by a Corporation for National and Community Service Learn and Serve Grant.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Brisbin Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for presentation at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.

Abstract

Civic and Political Education in Political Science: A Survey of Practices

In this paper the authors provide information about efforts by political scientists to enlighten students about the value of democratic civic and political norms and procedures and to encourage civic engagement. Our research question is: How and to what extent do college and university political science faculty engage in civic and political education that enlightens students and encourages civic engagement? In providing an answer to this general question we provide data to answer four specific questions. First, to what extent do political science faculty consider education about citizenship to be a primary teaching objective? Second, are the faculty members who rank citizenship education as a very important pedagogical objective more likely to be participants in civic and political organizations? Third, if faculty members believe citizenship education to be a primary focus for their teaching, are they more likely than other faculty to use an experiential learning pedagogy? Fourth, do departments promote and reward faculty efforts in civic and political education? To address these questions, the authors will use data from a national survey of political science department faculty members and chairs that they administered in the spring of 2002. We find that faculty who responded to this survey tended to believe that teaching civic responsibility was a fairly important goal. A smaller number, but still a majority of respondents, felt it was appropriate to require civic and political activity. Faculty level of civic and political engagement is a better predictor of faculty involvement in civic and political education than faculty rank, the type of department, gender, or even perceived appropriateness of teaching such courses. Faculty members who are not personally engaged in political and civic life are less likely to try to stimulate their students to become engaged. Finally, faculty and departments do not provide as effective an assessment of such courses as they might.

Civic and Political Education in Political Science: A Survey of Practices

Western liberal political philosophy asserts the necessity of political and civic education. From the eighteenth century to the present liberal scholars and community leaders have argued that democratic civic and political education helps maintain order in a society that grants enormous freedom to pursue one's self-interest (see Gutmann 1987). Especially education appears linked to the cognitive capacity of persons to learn and understand how to engage in democratic self-rule and to identify and act on their political preferences, or what has been called civic and political engagement. Thus, by political education we mean learning how an individual engages the institutions of governance and civic life for discrete ends. Also, education appears to provide "knowledge and acceptance of the norms and procedures of democracy" or a disposition that has been identified as democratic enlightenment. Consequently, by civic education we mean learning that encourages knowledge and trust in the social norms governing interpersonal behavior in a community as well as political engagement (Nie, Junn, and Strelik-Barry 1996, 11).

In this paper our research question is: How and to what extent do college and university political science faculty engage in civic and political education? This question is of relevance for the discipline of political science. In recent years social scientists have engaged in a debate about civic engagement and social capital. The contemporary debate began when sociologist James Coleman (1988) conceptualized social capital as a "variety of different entities," or institutions and networks and shared behavioral norms that produce or facilitate actors in the achievement of "certain ends" that enrich society and the lives of individual. Subsequently, Robert Putnam (2000) published a widely read argument that linked the decline of social capital to a decline in interpersonal trust with consequences for confidence in institutions and civic, political, and religious participation in communities. He has also identified the risk this decline poses for the effective performance of representative democracy (see also Brehm and Rahn 1997). To offset this risk, he argued that a partial remedy was "civics education" (Putnam 2000, 404-6). Indeed, considerable independent empirical evidence associates formal education–and specific civics education practices--with political and civic engagement and enlightenment and, especially, with political knowledge (Conover and Searing 2000; Nie, Junn, and Strelik-Barry 1996; Niemi and Junn 1998; Delli Carpini and Keeter 1996; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995, 416-60).

Although doubts have been cast on the argument about the decline of civic engagement and social capital (Ladd 1999; Pew Partnership for Civic Change 2001), the decline of social capital thesis has had a particular influence on American higher education. It especially has resulted in calls to colleges and universities to direct their attention to civic education, partnership with the community to service public needs, and the redesign of the university as an "engaged institution" (Elshtain, 1997; Kellogg Commission, 1999) that is "filled with the democratic spirit" (Boyte and Hollander 1999). Today, to socialize students in the value of civic engagement and to teach why civic responsibility is a worthy and important value, many institutions now offer courses with an experiential component. Behind these pedagogical techniques is an important assumption derived from the limited available

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

empirical evidence: experiential civic education of college and university students will learn how to engage in politics, enhance their commitment to civic engagement, help build social capital, and, ultimately, secure the legitimacy of representative democratic governments (see Battistoni 1997; Boyte 1993; Patrick 2000; Rimmerman 1997). In particular, proponents of investment in the development of social capital seek, first, higher education that encourages collective interaction–participation and voting–and the sharing of knowledge about community concerns, or civic engagement. Second, proponents believe that education should stress democratic enlightenment to foster trust in social norms governing interpersonal behavior in a community. Higher education that enhances the development of social capital should produce two kinds of outcomes: the public goods, such as peaceful, cooperative problem-solving, mutual acceptance of obligations and social tolerance, and the enhancement of the material welfare of a community, as well as the provision of private goods, such as the egalitarian opportunity for self-actualization or "happiness"–both psychologically and materially.

The political science discipline has not ignored either the evidence about a decline of civic engagement or the calls for educational reform. In 1996 President Elinor Ostrom of the American Political Science Association (APSA) established a Task Force on Civic Education. It determined that there was a problem--"evidence suggesting mounting political apathy in the United States"--and that "political education in the United States is inadequate across the board." They recommended teaching tolerance, collaboration, analysis, and "our traditions," including the "specific virtues on which effective political practice rests" (American Political Science Association, Task Force on Civic Education. 2000 [1998]). To date the Task Force has supported workshops and short courses at the Association's annual meeting, the production of on-line references and guides for teachers, and research on civic trust and education. Especially it has prompted the publication of Education for Civic Engagement in Political Science: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices (Mann and Patrick 2000), The Case for Representative Democracy: What Americans Should Know About Their Legislatures (Rosenthal, Kurtz, Hibbing, and Loomis 2001), and the posting of information at a website (American Political Science Association 2002). The first of these volumes presents research on how teaching methodologies can enhance college and university as well as high school students' civic engagement. As a palliative for the decline of civic and political engagement in this and other studies the authors often give special attention to service-learning, a form of experiential education that proposes a combined structured opportunities for (1) learning academic skills, (2) reflection on the normative dimensions of civic life, and (3) experiential activity that addresses community needs or assists individuals, families, and communities in need (see American Political Science Association. 2002; Barber 1997; Barber and Battistoni 1993; Battistoni 1997, 2000; Boyte and Farr 1997; Couto 1997; Ehrlich 1999; Hepburn 2000; Hepburn, Niemi, and Chapman 2000; Hudson 1997; Lisman 1998; Mendel-Reyes 1997; Owen 2000; Robinson 2000; Schwerin 1997; Walker 2000).[1]

---

[1] Despite some claims about the benefits of service learning for changing democratic and civic values, few detailed evaluations of the effect of service learning on students' political behavior and attitudes have been published (Hunter and Brisbin 2000; see the limited information in Astin and Sax

However, the influence of such efforts, as well as interests of individual political scientists in civic and political education, may not have much influence on the teaching of the bulk of collegiate political science students. We have two reasons for asserting this supposition. First, the discipline of political science has historically ignored civic education in higher education or pigeon-holed it as a subdisciplinary "specialty." From its earliest days as a discipline, in a period when the nation's leading intellectual--John Dewey (1916)--was writing about the value of civic education, political science has shied from encouraging civic education beyond abstract classroom discussions. Although several leaders of the profession and several committees of professional political science educators explored the role of the discipline in civic education in the decades immediately after the formation of American Political Science Association, such discussions bore little fruit. As early as 1910 professional committees examined education for citizenship, but they only recommended more classroom education in politics (Somit and Tanenhaus 1967, 80-83). Later committees and efforts funded by external grants in the 1950s also produced few tangible changes in the discipline's method of civic education, perhaps in part because instructors feared the effects of political activism among students when tenure was not secure, McCarthyism flourished, and fear of civic education becoming indoctrination or political advocacy was rampant (Leonard 1999; Ricci 1984, 67-70, 163-64; Schachter 1998; Somit and Tanenhaus 1967, 135-38, 195-99). By the 1960s civic education passed from the radar of the professional political science associations. For example, the American Political Science Association's Political Science: The State of the Discipline II (Finifter 1993), a summary of subfields of activity in the discipline, completely ignores civic and political education. The evidence thus is that during its first century political scientists have refined normative conceptions of the aims of political life, developed formal models of political actions, and gathered and analyzed data about political behavior. However, as a "learned profession" they have avoided roles as public intellectuals dedicated to a public good–the promotion of representative democracy and its accompanying political egalitarianism and politics of rights among their students.

Second, the focus of the discipline on the establishment of a science of politics or a normative analytic study of political ideas has encouraged an objective teaching methodology. Our experience suggests that higher education students are taught to regard political science as descriptive of politics and, sometimes, as about analysis of behavioral data, as normative critique of political ideas, or as the microeconomic examination of political institutions and behavior. In departments with which we are familiar, the bulk of courses features descriptive and analytical instruction in the classroom. Departments offer few courses that focus on political participation and democratic enlightenment and far fewer opportunities for students to learn about political engagement and civic norms through internships and training programs, leadership education programs, courses that include learning partnerships with governments or interest groups, courses that require field work and original data collection, and service learning and reflection courses.

1998; Eyler and Giles 1999: 19-24, 24-150, 212-14, 276-78, 280-82, 284-86; Gray et al. 1999, 56-98; Markus, Howard, and King 1993).

Although a trend toward "scientism" and a pattern of neglect of civic and political education within the profession is well-documented (Leonard 1995; Lindblom 1997; Smith 1997; Somit and Tanenhaus 1967, 109-33, 176-94), one of the godfathers of an objective scientific or behavioral approach in political science was Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago. Merriam, unlike many contemporary behaviorists, strongly supported civic education as the cornerstone of a progressive political future. By merging behavioral research and "current data" into teaching, he sought to provide citizens with sophisticated and realistic political analytic skills and an opportunity to become leaders. Through such an effort he thought that civic education would escape allegations of pedagogical indoctrination or advocacy and allow people to "become masters of their own destiny" (Merriam 1934). His approach of having students "develop actual experience in governing and being governed" (Merriam 1934, 137-71), what a contemporary scholar has called the education of "reflective practitioners" through students' design, practice, and reflection on the collection and use of information (Schön 1987), seems far from what most political science programs with which we are familiar do in the majority of their courses. Instead, political science has veered intoto training experts and has distanced itself from the education and enlightenment of the public (Ball 1995).

Therefore, as we enter the 21st century, civic and political education, especially through curricula such as service learning that encourage the active engagement of students in politics and their guided reflection on their experiences, appears to be marginal to the concerns of political scientists in higher education. Calls for civic and political education by the APSA either seem to be falling on deaf ears or run contrary to the motivations of the majority of faculty (Leonard 1999). However is this an accurate assessment? To permit an answer to this question, as described in the next section of this paper, we collected data on political and civic education by American political scientists. Then we used the data to address four more questions about civic and political education posed later in the paper: (1) To what extent do political science faculty member consider education about citizenship to be a primary teaching objective? (2) Are the faculty members who rank citizenship education as a very important pedagogical objective more likely to be participants in civic and political organizations? (3) If faculty members believe citizenship education is a duty for all faculty, are they more likely than other faculty members to use an experiential learning pedagogy? (4) Do departments promote and reward faculty members' efforts in civic and political education?

Data Collection and Analysis

Because of the very short funding period for this project the researchers chose an online survey rather than a mail survey as the primary data collection method. Because we only wanted political scientists who are currently teaching, we used political science department web sites as our source for e-mail and mailing addresses. Approximately 4000 e-mail addresses were collected and 2000 mailing addresses. The faculty survey was placed on a website for online completion and was also sent as an e-mail attachment. Approximately twenty-five percent of the e-mail addresses bounced for various reasons. Six hundred ten faculty responded by completing the online faculty survey, for a response rate of slightly over twenty percent. Surveys were mailed to a random sample of 600 political scientists.

Approximately 200 surveys were returned from this mailing, for a response rate of 33 percent. In addition, an e-mail or letter was sent to 200 chairpersons randomly selected from website information and the APSA Directory of Political Science Department Chairpersons, 1999-2000 (2000). At present, we have only forty-four responses for a response rate of approximately twenty percent. Because of time constraints, we did not complete a second mailing.

Our first concern was that the faculty and chair respondents reflect the overall makeup of teaching faculty in the United States. As Table 1 indicates, the respondents generally reflect the population of political science faculty in the United States as reported the APSA Survey of Political Science Departments 2000-2001 (2001). The percent male respondents mirrors the percentage of political science faculty in the U. S. who are male. Our sample appears to include relatively more small schools than the general population and fewer schools that have a separate political science department. Our responses also tended to come from schools offering only a B. A. (75 percent) as opposed to a M. A. or Ph.D. Although approximately 34 percent of schools responding to the APSA annual survey offer either an M. A. or Ph.D., only 20.5 percent of our Chair responses came from these types of schools. We did not collect information about the type of degrees offered in their department from our faculty respondents.

Insert Table 1 Here

Our faculty survey asked faculty their perception of their department's mission, their personal specialties, how they define their role, their feelings about the appropriateness of civic education, whether they teach relevant courses, and how they assess the programs or courses. The Chair survey asked about service learning and volunteer service offices, requirements for graduation, programs offered by the department, and assessment tools (See Appendix A and B for the surveys).

To complete the analysis, we computed several variables from responses to several questions on the faculty survey. Primary faculty role or assignment (teaching, research, and service) was recoded into the variable TEACHING, in which teaching, teaching and research and teaching and service were scored 1 and all other responses were coded zero. Professional specialty was recoded into POLICY, in which public policy and public administration were coded 1 and all other specialties were coded 0. The variable #HOURS is the number of hours the faculty member engaged in all forms of civic and political service, computed by adding the number of hours listed for all activities under question 5. The variable #ACTIONS is the number of civic and political actions (voting, writing letters, attending meetings) that the faculty member reported, and is compiled by a count of activities checked under question 6. Question 9 asks faculty about their efforts regarding political and civic education. We created the variable ED ENLIGHTEN as a dummy variable with faculty who checked either question 9a or question 9b as 1 (teach course or organize program or event with "explicit goal" of teaching civic and political responsibilities–efforts at democratic enlightenment) and all other responses to question 9 coded as 0. The variable ED ENGAGE was created as a dummy variable from questions 9c and 9d (teach course or organize program or event "to simulate" civic or political engagement), with those who

checked at least one coded 1 and all others 0. A list of all variable names is included in Appendix C.

Citizenship Education

To what extent do political science faculty consider education about citizenship to be a primary teaching objective? Two questions were established to measure faculty attitudes about the appropriateness of teaching civic education. In response to our question, "How appropriate do you think it is for political science faculty to teach students about the principal civic and political responsibilities or duties incumbent upon citizens in a democratic society?" More than 97 percent of the faculty responded that it was appropriate in some pedagogical situations, while 43.5 percent said they considered it to be a duty for all faculty. Faculty who are expected to excel in either research or a combination of teaching and research are most likely to feel teaching civic responsibilities is inappropriate. Those specializing in policy or public administration are most likely to feel teaching civic responsibilities is appropriate, with sixty percent of public administration faculty saying it is a duty to teach civic responsibilities. Male faculty are more likely to believe teaching civic responsibility is inappropriate--3.1 percent for male versus 0.9 percent for female faculty. Faculty rank was not an important factor.

Another question asked, "How appropriate do you think it is for political science faculty to require civic and political engagement or activities and political participation among students?" received a less favorable response rate, with 16.3 percent responding that such a requirement was inappropriate, and only 8.5 percent indicating it was a duty for all political science faculty. Seventy-five percent, however, felt it was appropriate in some pedagogical contexts. Again, faculty who are expected to excel in research or teaching and research were most negative, while faculty who teach public administration or public policy were most positive. Almost ninety percent (89.3 percent) felt that it was appropriate in at least some contexts to require civic or political activity among students in contrast to political theorists, of whom only 77.7 percent felt it was sometimes appropriate. Political theorists were the most opposed while American politics faculty were second most likely to support (82.7 percent). It appears that faculty who are more directly tied to the study of political action in America are also more likely to believe students should be engaged in civic or political action, while methodologists, theorists, and those specializing in international relations or comparative politics are less inclined to believe such activity is appropriate. Male faculty were also more likely to believe the requirement was inappropriate (19.4 percent for male faculty versus 9.2 percent for female faculty).

Faculty Political and Civic Activism and Civic Education

Are the faculty who rank citizenship education as a very important pedagogical objective more likely to be participants in civic and political organizations? Using question 7, the appropriateness of teaching civic and political responsibilities, a measure of democratic enlightenment abbreviated as APPTEACH, and question 8, the appropriateness of requiring civic or political participation, abbreviated as APPREQUIR as measurements of faculty attitudes about teaching civic responsibilities

and stimulating civic engagement (question 7 and question 8), and our computed variables #HOURS, which counts the number of hours per week the faculty member engages in volunteer activities, and #ACTIONS, which counts the types of civic actions taken by the faculty member during the past year, we find that faculty members who are civically active are more likely to believe teaching civic responsibility and requiring civic and political engagement by students are appropriate pedagogical tools. As the information in Table 2 indicates, both #HOURS and #ACTIONS variables were strongly correlated with both the perceived appropriateness of teaching and the appropriateness of requiring civic and political engagement.

Insert Table 2 Here

Political science faculty attitudes about civic education appear to be somewhat affected by the type of volunteer or civic activity in which the faculty member engages. Family and church related activities are not correlated with attitudes about teaching civic responsibility. Attitudes about requiring civic and political engagement are, however, correlated with church activities and serving on boards as a volunteer but not with other volunteer activities. Attending hearings and writing letters are the two civic actions most strongly related to attitudes about both teaching and requiring civic and political activities.

Regression analysis (OLS) was used to examine the relative impact of independent variables on faculty attitudes about teaching civic responsibilities and stimulating civic and political engagement. Table 3 reports the regression results. Although primary faculty role (TEACHING) was originally included in the model, it was not significant. Field of teaching, the number of hours of community service, the number of civic actions, and gender all contribute to faculty attitudes about teaching civic responsibilities. The model is very similar when regarding faculty attitudes about requiring civic and political engagement, but the faculty role (teaching versus research or service) makes a difference in this model. Faculty attitudes about requiring civic and political engagement are strongly related to their personal level of civic participation and to their gender, with their role, number of hours of community service, and teaching area all significant as well.

Insert Table 3 Here

To what degree does faculty behavior reflect their attitudes about teaching? We asked faculty whether they taught a range of courses or organized programs with specific goals of teaching civic responsibilities or stimulating civic action (questions 9a through question 9d). The majority of respondents teach or organize at least one of the courses or programs listed. Only 15.6 percent indicated that they do not teach or organize any of the twelve options offered. Another 39.4 percent teach a course to stimulate civic engagement; 53.0 percent teach a course that teaches civic responsibilities; 35.1 percent organize programs to teach civic responsibilities; and 33.9 percent organize a program to stimulate civic engagement. Only 30 percent responded that they neither taught nor organized any of the four. Although a majority of faculty (53 percent) indicate that they teach a

course with an explicit goal of teaching civic responsibility, we do not have course syllabi or other evidence to describe the manner by which this goal is achieved. Only three faculty members provided syllabi or program descriptions to us. Also, our options include Model OAS, Model UN, internships, and other programs that may not have any explicit learning objective related to civic responsibilities or civic action. For that reason, our analysis only considers the first four options described above and service learning, a pedagogy widely touted as a mechanism for engaging students in civic life.

As with attitudes, faculty who engaged in either volunteer activities or civic activities appeared to be more likely also to both teach civic responsibilities and require civic action among their students. An OLS regression found perceived appropriateness of teaching (APPTEACH) and #ACTIONS, then #HOURS. When efforts to stimulate engagement, ED ENGAGE, is added to the model, it improved significantly. With regard to requiring civic and political engagement, results are similar. APPTEACH and #ACTIONS are significant at <0.005, while APPREQUIR, #HOURS and GENDER are significant at <0.05. Table 4 reports these findings.

Insert Table 4 Here

Personal civic and political engagement is more important than volunteer work in guiding faculty members' decisions to teach civic education courses. The faculty member's teaching field does not contribute to any of the models. How they perceive their role (TEACHING) is significant only with regard to faculty decisions to teach civic education courses, if teaching courses to stimulate civic and political engagement (ED ENGAGE) is removed from the equation and TEACHING is not related to faculty decisions to require civic activity at all. Although gender does not predict teaching of civic education courses, it does appear to be related to teaching of courses that require civic activity. Therefore, we conclude that the political science faculty who rank citizenship education as a very important pedagogical objective are more likely to be participants in civic and political organizations. Political and civic activism by faculty animates their efforts at civic and political education and the encouragement of political engagement.

Faculty Choice of Experiential Education

If faculty believe citizenship education is a duty for all faculty, are they more likely than other faculty to use an experiential learning pedagogy? How do they assess the success of this activity?

Because service learning is often touted as a method for either teaching civic responsibilities or stimulating civic and political engagement, we asked whether faculty use service learning (although we did not specifically tie it to civic outcomes). Approximately 26 percent of the faculty respondents said that they use service learning. The use of service learning is highly correlated with #HOURS and #ACTIONS–our measures of faculty civic and political engagement, APPREQUIR, APPTEACH--our measures of the appropriateness of teaching and requiring courses on civic and political civic enlightenment, and ED ENLIGHTEN and ED ENGAGE--our measures of faculty actions such as

organizing programs related to civic responsibility or stimulating civic engagement. In addition, rank is associated with service learning courses. Tenured faculty with between seven and fourteen years of service are most likely to use service learning (34.3 percent) while those faculty with more than 25 years of teaching are least likely to report using service learning (19.3 percent). Female faculty are more likely to use service learning (32.2 percent) than male faculty (24.4 percent).

Table 5 shows the results of an OLS regression analysis with backward removal of variables and teaching of service learning as the dependent variable. Originally included in the model (model 1)--as independent variables--are gender, Rank, #HOURS (hours of community service), INCENTIVES, POLICY (teach policy field), ED ENLIGHTEN ED ENGAGE, TEACHING (primary faculty role), #ACTIONS (number of civic activities), APPTEACH (appropriateness of teaching civic or political responsibility), and APPREQUIR (appropriateness of requiring civic or political engagement). Field of teaching was recoded into a dummy variable with policy and public administration scored one and all other values set to zero. Faculty role was scored as teaching or teaching and service rated one and all else scored zero.

Insert Table 5 Here

Model 1 shows the unstandardized beta coefficients for the first run. All variables except RANK remained in the equation. Model 2 is the best fit model, iteration six. This final model indicates that ED ENGAGE and APPREQUIR are the most important predictors of teaching service learning. These variables measure attitudes about requiring civic activity and actual teaching of courses to stimulate civic activity. The level of faculty civic activity and whether the faculty member teaches in policy or public administration are next in importance. Faculty who are themselves active, who teach in a field that is often applied, and who believe courses that involve students in civic activity are appropriate are also the faculty who are most likely to use service learning as a pedagogical tool.

Whether a faculty member teaches a service learning course can best be predicted by OLS model 3 that includes efforts to stimulate political engagement--ED ENGAGE--and APPREQUIR, #ACTION, POLICY, #HOURS. The final adjusted R^2 is 0.158, S.E. = 0.41. Less important in this model are gender and whether faculty teach or organize programs on civic and political responsibility. Most significant is whether they organize programs to stimulate civic engagement. It appears that most faculty perceive service learning as a tool to achieve that particular goal. The model thus suggests that the political science faculty who use service learning are politically and civically committed faculty who plan classes to require student's civic and political engagement. Faculty who are not personally engaged are not likely to push students to become engaged. Gender, degree of personal civic involvement, and whether they teach civic responsibility are the best predictors of attitudes on appropriateness of requiring civic action, but multicollinearity causes these variables to drop out when predicting the use of service learning.

A Note on the Assessment of Experiential Education and Service Learning

Of those faculty reporting that they use service learning, 19 percent report no formal assessment of civic understanding and 21.1 percent do no formal assessment of student's political engagement. The most common form of assessment is exit interviews (53.3 percent for civic understanding and 69.2 percent for political engagement). Also, 42.7 percent report that they use exams, papers, or a senior thesis to measure students' level of civic understanding, and 52.1 percent use these methods to measure students' political engagement. Perhaps most interesting but also disturbing, is that 11.1 percent of those faculty who say they use service learning, do not require any form of reflection, 8.4 percent use journals, 45.3 percent use class discussion, and 35.3 percent use a combination of journals and class discussion. Because reflection is considered to be an essential component of service learning, it appears that more than ten percent of the faculty who say they use service learning are leaving out an important component of service learning or may misunderstand what a service learning course should include.

Assessment of Activities

As Table 6 indicates, a majority of faculty who report that they teach courses or organize programs to stimulate civic engagement, provide no formal assessment at all. Exams are the most common tool used by those who do assess their student activities. Almost a majority (46.3 percent) of faculty who report teaching courses or organizing programs with an explicit goal of teaching civic responsibility also provide no formal assessment.

Insert Table 6 Here

Incentives for Civic Education

Do departments promote and reward faculty efforts in civic and political education? Overall, it appears that very few faculty receive any extra rewards for teaching such courses. Only 20.3 percent of faculty members reported receiving any incentives. However, the more of these courses or activities in which a faculty engaged, the more likely they were to receive some form of incentive. Over 35 percent of those who taught all four types of "civic" courses reported incentives. The most common incentive reported (12 percent) was consideration of the activity in promotion and tenure decisions. The existence of incentives did not contribute significantly toward attitudes about teaching, requiring civic activity, nor did it predict whether faculty taught any of the twelve possible civic education options. Faculty apparently make these choices on the basis of personal philosophy rather than department or college incentives.

Chairs' Responses

With only forty-four responses from departments, we cannot claim to have a representative sample. We believe that even our faculty sample is skewed toward people who believe civic education to be an important part of the political science curriculum. We hope to increase our department response to have a more representative sample. A majority of chair respondents, 57.5 percent, report that their college or university has an office for service learning; 13.6 percent report a college service requirement for graduation; 45.5 percent say their college has programs with an explicit goal of teaching students about civic responsibilities; 38.6 percent report having a program or event that has a goal of stimulating or requiring civic and political engagement; and over 40 percent report programs or courses offered by their department with explicit goals. Over 90 percent offer internships and 52.3 percent say they offer service learning courses. However, 67.4 percent say there is no formal assessment of courses with a civic responsibility goal and 87.5 percent say there is no formal assessment of programs or courses to stimulate civic engagement. These percentages are even higher than faculty reports on assessment.

Conclusion

Overall, faculty who responded to this survey tended to believe that teaching civic responsibility was a fairly important goal. A smaller number, but still a majority of respondents, felt it was appropriate to require civic activity. Faculty level of civic engagement is a better predictor of faculty involvement in civic education than their rank, the type of department, gender, or even perceived appropriateness of teaching such courses. Faculty who are not personally engaged are unlikely to try to stimulate their students to become engaged. Faculty voluntarism is less connected to their attitudes or behaviors related to teaching.

It is somewhat disturbing that a high percentage of faculty--and departments--who teach these courses or organize programs with explicit civic or political goals do not provide a formal assessment of their students, achievement in light of these goals. Students are unlikely to understand these to be serious goals if no assessment occurs. This suggests that the courses offered are often traditional political science courses that provide facts about Congress, the bureaucracy, or other facets of government, without actually requiring students to understand or act upon the citizen role in policy making.

Stephen Leonard (1999) has argued that the current attention to civic education by political science associations will go the way of past discussions of the topic–filed and forgotten. He suggests that their must be incentives for practitioner to change what they do, such as rewards in the promotion and tenure process or in pay. Whether or not his assessment is accurate (compare Bennett 1999), our evidence suggests that an activist core of faculty are the political scientists who provide political and civic education and experiential learning and reflection through curricular methods such as service learning. These faculty, however, are not in the majority within the profession.

Recommendations

This paper suggests that faculty are likely to report support for civic education goals, but that only more politically or civically activist faculty design courses to encourage the democratic enlightenment and political and civic engagement of students. Therefore our first recommendation is that the discipline and individual departments rationally assess their departmental objectives. If the department chooses as an objective the civic and political education of students, it must then design its program and encourage its faculty to advance the objective.

How? Our data suggest that one way to advance toward the civic and political education of students as a collective objective might be to employ faculty who willingly join into civic and political activities and education. For several reasons, this is difficult to do. Graduate education in political science almost always neglects education in the pedagogy of civic and political education. The professional idea of the reputedly objective, scientific scholar militates against the employment of professors whose idea of appropriate scholarly activity is devotion to challenging students to entering into politics and civic life rather than producing students knowledgeable only on of political facts, processes, and philosophical controversies. Faculty members who commit to civic education face the problem of devoting considerable time to an activity that might not be weighed as important as other activities at the time of tenure or promotion.

Therefore, our second recommendation is that the profession, perhaps with support from the APSA, commit to a reexamination of the relative lack of systematic attention to pedagogy in graduate education. Our third recommendation is that universities and departments, with an objective of civic and political education, reconsider their hiring practices. Our fourth recommendation is that departments committed to civic and political education as important goals should strongly encourage the use of formal assessment of faculty in relation to this objective when making tenure and promotion decisions. In a related vein, our fifth recommendation is that departments that support civic and political education must provide incentives for faculty to invest extra time and effort in programs that are designed to achieve these goals. This is especially true of the most thoroughgoing efforts at civic and political education–service learning courses.

Finally, our study suggests that many faculty members who teach civic and political education and, especially, service learning courses are not including systematic, critical reflection in their courses. This may be because of a lack of skill in this aspect of political education and experiential and service learning courses. Therefore, our final recommendation is that departments, colleges, or universities that urge faculty to adopt service learning and related methods of civic and political education must provide adequate support in the form of workshops, mentoring, or other assistance to these faculty, particularly with regard to reflection and assessment.

Appendix A

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is the Civic Education Survey about which we wrote you a few days ago. As we mentioned, this study is about the degree to which political science departments incorporate the study of civic and political responsibilities into their curriculum.

First, we would like you to tell us a little bit about your department and its role in your university.

Q(1). Would you say that your college administrators encourage your department to excel primarily in teaching, research, service, or some combination?

____1. Teaching
____2. Research
____3. Service
____4. Combination of teaching and research
____5. Combination of teaching and service

Q(2). How many years you have been a faculty member at the college level?

_____Years

Q(3). What subfield do you consider to be your *primary* teaching and research specialty? Please check only one.

____1. American Political Behavior
____2. American Political Institutions
____3. Judicial Politics and Public Law
____4. Public Policy
____5. Public Administration
____6. Political Philosophy
____7. International Politics
____8. Comparative Politics
____9. Methodology
____10. Other: _____

Q(4). Do you consider yourself to be:

_____1. Primarily a researcher
_____2. Primarily a teacher
_____3. Equally balanced between teaching and research

_____4. Primarily an administrator
_____5. Other: _____

The following questions refer to your *personal civic and political activities and perspectives*.

Q(5). For each of the following, please put the number of hours per week, on average, that you spend in that activity. If you do not participate at all, please put NA on that line.

____1. Hours per week volunteer work with a non-profit organization other than a church in my area.
____2. Hours per week volunteer work with a church based group in my area.
____3. Hours per week service on a community board or council as an elected or appointed member
____4. Hours per week work with a community board or council just as a volunteer
____5. Hours per week volunteering with a family related activity (e.g. child's little league)
____6. Hours per week in other volunteer or civic activities. Please describe_____

Q(6). Please check any of the following in which you personally were engaged during the past year:

____1. Voting in a general election
____2. Participating in a political forum, debate, or discussion to inform the public
____3. Attending, but not participating in a political forum or debate
____4. Attending city council or other regularly scheduled government meeting
____5. Writing letters to elected officials about an issue.
____6. Participating in a hearing, demonstration, or other activity with regard to a local decision.
____7. Working on a political campaign for someone else
____8. Running for office or serving in an elected or appointed position.

Q(7). How appropriate do you think it is for political science faculty to teach students about the principal civic and political responsibilities or duties incumbent upon citizens in a democratic society?

_____1. Not appropriate in any pedagogical context
_____2. Appropriate in some pedagogical contexts
_____3. A duty for all political science faculty in all pedagogical contexts
_____4. Not sure

Q(8.) How appropriate do you think it is for political science faculty to stimulate or require civic and political engagement or activity and political participation among students?

_____1. Not appropriate in any pedagogical context
_____2. Appropriate in some pedagogical contexts
_____3. A duty for all political science faculty in all pedagogical contexts
_____4. Not sure

Q(9). There are many ways in which a faculty member might teach civic and political responsibilities or involve students in civic activities. For the following list, please check ALL that YOU PERSONALLY undertake:

____1. Teach course with explicit goal of teaching civic and political responsibilities
____2. Organize a program or event with an explicit goal of teaching civic and political responsibilities
____3. Teach a course with an explicit goal of stimulating civic engagement
____4. Organize a program or event with an explicit goal of stimulating civic engagement
____5. Supervise Model United Nations
____6. Supervise Model OAS
____7. Supervise public interest research group (PIRG)
____8. Advise college based political party group
____9. Supervise political forum/speaker series managed by students
____10. Supervise Internships
____11. Require observation of political or civic activity for a course
____12. Incorporate service learning into course
____13. Other, Please describe: _____

If you checked any of the above, please answer the following. If you did not check any above, please go to Question 14 below.

Q(10). Do you assess the success of the courses or programs in achieving an understanding of civic responsibilities among your students?

____1. No, no formal assessment
____2. Yes, by exit interviews/surveys
____3. Yes, by examination/paper/senior thesis
____4. Other means, please list_____

Q(11). Do you assess the success of the courses or programs in achieving a higher level of civic engagement among your students?

____1. No, no formal assessment
____2. Yes, by exit interviews/surveys
____3. Yes, by examination/paper/senior thesis
____4. Other means, please list_____

Q(12). To what degree do you use reflection through journals or class discussion to help students understand the role of civic and political participation in improving their community?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

____1. Require student reflection through journal keeping.
____2. Require student reflection by participation in class discussions
____3. Require student reflection both by journal keeping and participation in class discussions
____4. Do not use either method.

Q(13). In what ways, if any, does your department encourage or reward your work with these activities (those checked from Question 9)? Please check all that apply.

_____1. I receive a course load reduction
_____2. I receive extra pay for supervising these activities
_____3. I receive credit toward promotion and tenure
_____4. I receive other rewards (please describe)_____
_____5. I receive no rewards or incentives for performing these activities.

Finally, we need just one or two demographic items for purposes of analysis:

Q(14). Your Gender:

____1. Female
____2. Male

Q(15). Your Rank in the Department:

____1. Assistant
____2. Associate
____3. Full
____4. Other

We would greatly appreciate copies of syllabi, brochures, flyers, or other materials that address the topics of civic or political education and participation by students. We would also appreciate your assistance in requesting that faculty engaged in any of these teaching activities complete the enclosed survey for us.

If you wish to discuss your programs with us, please provide us with a telephone number here:_____

Please e-mail materials and information to: shunter2@wvu.edu

Please mail materials to Civic and Political Education Project, Department of Political Science, West Virginia University, Box 6317, Morgantown, WV 26501-6317

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BELOW OR ON THE BACK OF THIS SURVEY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Appendix B

Chair Survey

Thank you for agreeing to complete our survey on civic and political education. As mentioned in our cover letter, all responses are completely voluntary and will be kept completely confidential. You may refuse to answer any or all questions.

Our first questions are about your institution and department.

1. Would you say that your college administrators encourage your department to excel primarily in teaching, research, service, or some combination?

_____1. Teaching
_____2. Research
_____3. Service
_____4. Combination of Teaching and Research
_____5. Combination of Teaching and Service
_____6. Other: _____

2. Does your college/university have an office for service learning?

____1.Yes
____2. No

3. Does your college/university have an office to coordinate student activities?

____1.YES
____2. NO

4. Does your college/university have a community service requirement for graduation?

____1.YES
____2. NO

5. What is the highest political science degree offered by your college/university?

____1. PhD
____2. MA
____3. BA
____4. Associate
____5. No Political Science degree offered.

6. Is your college/university state or private?

____1. State ____2. Private

7. Is your department only political science, or is it located in a department/division that contains more than one academic discipline (e.g. social sciences)?

_____1. ONLY POLITICAL SCIENCE
_____2. CONTAINS OTHER DISCIPLINES

8. How many Bachelor's degrees in political science are awarded (on average) per year by your department? _____

9. How many full-time political science faculty serve in your department? _____

10. Does your department have any programs, courses or annual special events that have an *explicit and central pedagogical goal* of teaching or informing students about the principal civic and political responsibilities or duties incumbent upon citizens in a democratic society?

_____1. YES
_____2. NO ----> SKIP TO Question 11

10a. IF YES, please briefly describe

10b. Is this meant for political science majors or for the general student population?

_____1. MAJORS
_____2. GENERAL STUDENT POPULATION

10c. How many students participate in a typical academic year?

_____1. UNDER 25
_____2. 25 TO 50

_____3. 50 TO 100
_____4. OVER 100

11. Does your department have any programs, courses, or annual special events that have an *explicit AND PEDAGOGICAL GOAL* of stimulating or requiring civic and political engagement or activity and political participation among students?

____1. YES
____2. NO-----> IF NO SKIP TO QUESTION 12.

IF YES: 11a. Is this the same program as described in question 5?
_____1. YES ------> SKIP TO QUESTION 12
_____2. NO

IF NO, 11b. Please briefly describe:

11c. Is this meant for political science majors or for the general student population?

_____1. MAJORS
_____2. GENERAL STUDENT POPULATION

11d. How many students participate in a typical academic year?

_____1. UNDER 25
_____2. 25 TO 50
_____3. 50 TO 100
_____4. OVER 100: IF YOU HAVE A GOOD NUMBER, PLEASE ENTER IT HERE:_____

12. There are many ways a department might encourage civic responsibility and engagement aside from those with an explicit objective. For each of the following, please check all that your department sponsors:

_____a. Teach a course with an explicit learning goal related to civic and political responsibilities
_____b. Organize a program or event with an explicit goal of teaching civic and political

responsibilities

_____c. Teach a course with an explicit goal of stimulating civic engagement
_____d. Organize a program or event with an explicit goal of stimulating political engagement.
_____e. Supervise Model United Nations
_____f. Supervise MODEL OAS
_____g. Supervise PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP
_____h. Advise COLLEGE BASED POLITICAL PARTY group
_____i. Supervise POLITICAL FORUMS/SPEAKER series managed by students
_____j. Supervise internships
_____k. Require observation of political or civic activity for a course.
_____l. Incorporate service learning into a course.

13. How do you assess these programs impacts on student understanding of civic responsibilities?

____1. NO FORMAL ASSESSMENT
____2. EXIT INTERVIEWS/SURVEYS
____3. EXAM/PAPER/SENIOR THESIS
____4. ASSESS BY OTHER MEANS

14. How do you assess these programs impacts on students level of political engagement?

____1. NO FORMAL ASSESSMENT
____2. EXIT INTERVIEWS/SURVEYS
____3. EXAM/PAPER/SENIOR THESIS
____4. ASSESS BY OTHER MEANS

15. Are there other ways in which your department teaches civic responsibilities or encourages political engagement, that our survey has not asked about?

_____1.YES
_____2. NO

IF YES, Please describe:

We would greatly appreciate copies of syllabi, brochures, flyers, or other materials that address these civic concerns. We would also appreciate your assistance in requesting that your faculty complete the enclosed survey for us. Unless you have no teaching role in your department, we would like you to also complete the enclosed survey.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Appendix C

Variables Used in Analysis

Q=Question on Faculty Survey

APPTEACH: Q7.

APPREQUIR: Q8.

ED ENGAGE: Q9C and Q9D. Coded 1 if respondent checked either 9C or 9D. Coded 0 if neither is checked.

ED ENLIGHTEN: Q9A and Q9B. Coded 1 if respondent checked either 9A or 9B. Coded 0 if neither is checked.

INCENTIVES : Coded 0 if 5 (no rewards) is checked. Else, coded 1.

POLICY: Coded 1 if Q3 is checked 4 (public policy) or 5 (public administration). Coded 0 for all other subfields.

#ACTION: Created by counting number of options checked under Q6. Each is coded separately so a maximum of eight options are available. Coding is 0 - 8.

#HOURS: Computed by adding interval level of responses for Q5(1-6). Each is coded separately so responses are added.

TEACHING: Coded 0 if respondent checked research, service, or other. Coded 1 if respondent checked teaching, teaching and research, or teaching and service.

References:

American Political Science Association. 2000. Directory of Political Science Departmental Chairpersons, 1999-2000. Washington, D. C. American Political Science Association.

American Political Science Association. 2001. Survey of Political Science Departments (2000-2001). Washington, D. C. American Political Science Association.

American Political Science Association. 2002a. "Civic Education Network," Location: http://www.apsanet.org/CENnet/

American Political Science Association. 2002b. "Service Learning in Political Science." Location: http://www.apsanet.org/teach/service/

American Political Science Association, Task Force on Civic Education. 2000 [1998]. "Articulation Statement: A Call for Reactions and Contributions." In Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy. Ed. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.

Astin, Alexander W. and Linda J. Sax. 1998. How Undergraduates are Affected by Service Participation. Journal of College Student Development 39: 251-63.

Ball, Terence. 1995. "An Ambivalent Alliance: Political Science and American Democracy," In Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions. Ed. James Farr, John S. Dryzek, and Stephen T. Leonard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barber, Benjamin R.1997. Afterword. In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

------ and Richard Battistoni. 1993. "A Season of Service: Introducing Service Learning into the Liberal Arts Curriculum." P.S.: Political Science and Politics 26: 235-40, 262.

Battistoni, Richard M. 1997. "Service Learning and Democratic Citizenship." Theory into Practice 36: 150-56.

------. 2000. "Service Learning and Civic Education." In Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy. Ed. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.

Bennett, Stephen Earl. 1999. "The Pat Need Not Be Prologue: Why Pessimism about Civic Education Is Premature," P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 623-26.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Boyte, Harry C. 1993. "Civic Education as Public Leadership Development." P.S.: Political Science and Politics 26:763-69.

------ and James Farr. 1997. "The Work of Citizenship and the Problem of Service-Learning." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

------ and Elizabeth Hollander. 1999. Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American University. Washington, D.C.: Campus Compact.

Brehm, John and Wendy Rahn. 1997. "Individual-Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital." American Journal of Political Science 41: 999-1023.

Campbell, David E. "Social Capital and Service Learning." P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 647-49.

Coleman, James. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." American Journal of Sociology 94: S95-S120.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Searing, Donald D. 2000. "A Political Socialization Perspective." In Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education. Ed. Lorraine M. McDonnell, P. Michael Timpane, and Roger Benjamin. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Couto, Richard A. 1997. "Civic Leadership." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. 1996. What American Know About Politics and Why It Matters. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education : an introduction to the philosophy of education. New York : Macmillan.

Ehrlich, Thomas. 1999. Civic Education: Lessons Learned." P.S. Political Science and Politics 32: 245-49.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1997. "The Decline of Democratic Faith." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Eyler, Janet and Dwight E. Giles, Jr. 1999. Where's the Service in Service Learning? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finifter, Ada W. ed. 1993. Political Science: The State of the Discipline II. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

Gray, Maryann Jacobi, Elizabeth Heneghan Ondaatje, Ronald D. Fricker, Sandy A. Geschwind, Charles A. Goldman, Tessa Kaganoff, Abby Eisenshtat Robyn, Lori J. Vogelgesang, Stephen P. Klein, Nancy Campbell, Kathy Rosenblatt. 1999. Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.

Gutmann, Amy. 1987. Democratic Education. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hepburn, Mary A. 2000. "Service Learning and Civic Education in the Schools: What Does Recent Research Teach Us?" In Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy. Ed. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.

------, Richard G. Niemi, and Chris Chapman. 2000. "Service Learning in Political Science: Queries and Commentary." P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 617-22.

Hudson, William E. 1997. "Service-Learning in the Study of American Public Policy." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Hunter, Susan and Richard A. Brisbin, Jr. 2000. "The Impact of Service Learning on Democratic and Civic Values." P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 623-26.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Ladd, Everett Carll. 1999. The Ladd Report. New York: The Free Press.

Leonard, Stephen T. 1995. "The Pedagogical Purposes of a Political Science," In Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions. Ed. James Farr, John S. Dryzek, and Stephen T. Leonard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------ 1999. "'Pure Futility and Waste': Academic Political Science and Civic Education," P.S. Political Science and Politics 32: 749-53.

Lindblom, Charles. 1997. "Political Science in the 1940s and 1950s," in American Academic Culture in Transition: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines. Ed. Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lisman, C. David. 1998. Toward a Civil Society: Civic Literacy and Service Learning. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Mann, Sheliah and John J. Patrick, eds. Education for Civic Engagement in Political Science: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.

Markus, Gregory B., Jeffrey P. F. Howard, and David C. King. 1993. Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances learning: Results form an Experiment. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 15: 410-19.

Mendel-Reyes, Meta. 1997, "Teaching/Theorizing/Practicing Democracy: An Activist's Perspective on Service-Learning in Political Science." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Merriam, Charles E. 1934. Civic Education in the United States. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies Part VI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Nie, Norman H., Jane Junn, and Kenneth Strehlik-Barry. 1996. Education and Democratic Citizenship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Niemi, Richard G. and Jane Junn. 1998. Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Owen, Diana. 2000. "Service Learning and Political Socialization." P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 639-41.

Patrick, John J. 2000. "Introduction to Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy." In Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy. Ed. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies.

Patterson, Amy S. 2000. "Incorporating Service Learning into International Relations Courses," P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 817-22.

Pew Partnership for Civic Change. 2001. "New Survey Dispels Myth on Citizen Engagement." Location: http://pew-partnership.org/whatsnew.html

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ricci, David M. 1984. The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rimmerman, Craig A. 1997. The New Citizenship: Unconventional Politics, Activism, and Service. Boulder: Westview Press.

Robinson, Tony. 2000. "Service Learning as Justice Advocacy: Can Political Scientists Do Politics?" P.S. Political Science and Politics 33: 605-11.

Rosenthal, Alan, Karl T. Kurtz, John Hibbing, and Burdett Loomis eds. 2000. The Case for Representative Democracy: What Americans Should Know About Their Legislatures. Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Schachter, Hindy Lauer. 1998. "Civic Education: Three Early American Political Science Associations and Their Relevance for Our Times," P.S. Political Science and Politics 31: 631-35.

Schön, Donald A. 1987.Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schwerin, Ed. 1997. "Service-Learning and Empowerment." In Experiencing Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science. Ed. Richard M. Battistoni and William E. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Smith, Rogers P. 1997. "Still Blowing in the Wind: The Quest for a Democratic, Scientific Political Science," in American Academic Culture in Transition: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines. Ed. Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Snyder, R. Claire. 2001. "Should Political Science Have a Civic Mission? An Overview of the Historical Evidence," P.S. Political Science and Politics 34: 301-5.

Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. 1967. The Development of American Political Science: From Burgess to Behavioralism. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Scholzman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walker, Tobi. 2000. "The Service/Politics Split: Rethinking Service to Teach Political Engagement." P.S. Political Science and Politics 33 (September 2000): 647-49.

Table 1: Comparison of APSA Department Survey Results to Chair and Faculty Survey Results

	APSA SURVEY OF DEPARTMENTS	CHAIR RESPONDENTS	FACULTY RESPONDENTS
Percent Male	71%	NA	71%
Percentage under 10 faculty	64.8%	81.4%	NA
Percent Public Institution	49.7%	48.8%	NA
Percent Ph.D. Offering	16.8%	11.9%	NA
Percent Political Science Department	73.6%	61.9%	NA

Table 2: Appropriateness of civic and political teaching and requiring civic and political engagement by level of faculty civic and political involvement

Pearson Correlation	Faculty Hours of Volunteer Work	Number of Faculty Civic Activities
Appropriate to Teach Civic Values	.182	.251
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
Appropriate to Require Civic Action	.142	.187
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000

Table 3: Factors Predicting Faculty Attitudes on Appropriateness of Teaching Civic Responsibilities (APPTEACH) and Requiring Civic Engagement (APPREQUIR).

MODEL	APPTEACH Appropriateness of Teaching Civic and Political Responsibilities	APPREQUIR Appropriateness of Requiring Civic and Political Participation
Constant	1.943 *** (0.073)	1.530 *** (0.068)
TEACHING	7.243E-02 (.050)	0.116 * (0.046)
POLICY	0.171 ** (0.056)	0.108 * (0.052)
#HOURS	1.283E-02 ** (0 .004)	8.163E-02 * (0.003)
GENDER	9.452E-02 * (0.040)	9.811E-02 ** (0.038)
#ACTION	7.766E-02 *** (0.013)	5.862E-02 *** (0.012)
Note: * = Sig. At < .1 ** = Sig. At < .01 *** = Sig. At < .00	R^2 = 0.092	R^2=0.065

Table 4: Factors determining Faculty Teaching Activities—(ED ENLIGHTEN or Teaching Civic and Political Responsibilities and ED ENGAGE or Teaching Civic and Political Participation)

Independent VARIABLES	ED ENLIGHTEN Teach Responsibilities		ED ENGAGE Teach Engagement
	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	
Constant	-0.162 *	-0.403 ***	-0.437***
	(0.092)	(0.103)	(0.102)
APPTEACH	0.198 ***	0.261 ***	0.120 ***
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.033)
APPREQUIR	2.109E-02	5.915E-02 *	9.250E-02 **
	(0.034)	(0.012)	(0.012)
#ACTIONS	3.888E-02 ***	5.528E-02 ***	4.265E-02 ***
	(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.012)
#HOURS	4.743E-02	7.665E-03) **	7.750E-03 **
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
ED ENGAGE	.298 ***	NA	NA
	(0.034)		
POLICY	2.493E-02	2.596E-02	-1.132E-02
	(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.048)
TEACHING	NA	.101 **	4.492E-02
		(0.043)	(0.043)
GENDER	-4.482E-02	-2.565E-02	8.006E-02 **
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)
ADJUSTED R^2	0.246	0.175	0.238
S.E.	0.4231	0.4428	0.4356

Dependent variables are ED ENLIGHTEN and ED ENGAGE. S.E. is reported in parentheses in each cell.

Table 5: Factors Predicting use of Service Learning as a Pedagogical Tool

FACTOR	MODEL 1	MODEL 2
Constant	-.423 (.103)	-.286 *** (.068)
GENDER	5.309E-02 (.034)	-------
#HOURS	7.732E-02 * (.003)	8.015E-03 * (.003)
INCENTIVES	3.596E-02 (.039)	———
POLICY	.124 ** (.047)	.124** (.046)
ED ENLIGHTEN	6.001E-02 (.036)	6.847E-02 * (.036)
ED ENGAGE	.142 *** (.036)	.154 *** (.036)
TEACHING	3.120E-02 (.042)	--------
APPREQUIR	0.135*** (.035)	.139 *** (.033)
APPTEACH	2.362E-02 (.033)	———
#ACTIONS	3.412E-02 ** (.012)	3.454E-02 *** (.011)
Adjusted R^2 S. E.	.158 .41	.159 .41

NOTE: RANK was included in the analysis, but was excluded in the first iteration so was not included for reporting.

Note: * = Significance <0.10; ** Significant at <0.05; *** Significance <0.005

Table 6: Assessment of Enlightenment and Engagement by Teaching of Enlightenment and Engagement

Type of Assessment	Percent Respondents Requiring Civic Activity (N=401)	Percent Respondents Teaching Enlightenment (N= 475)
No formal	64.3%	46.3%
Exit Interviews/Surveys	8.5%	5.7%
Examinations	15.5%	34.3%
Assess in other way	11.7%	13.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Civic and Political Education in Political Science: A Survey of Practices	
Author(s): Richard Brisbin, Jr. and Susan Hunter	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑

XX

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Richard A. Brisbin / Susan Hunter	Printed Name/Position/Title: Richard A. Brisbin, Jr. and Susan Hunter, Associate Professors	
Organization/Address: Department of Political Science, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV	Telephone: 304 293 3811	FAX: 304 293 8644
	E-Mail Address: Richard.Brisbin@mail.wvu.edu	Date: 10/24/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)